DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 639 EA 007 085

AUTHOR Ramsey, Margaret A.
TITLE Power, Status, and Cognitive Territory in Educational Administration.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (60th, Washington, D. C., March 31-April 4, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Theories; Bureaucracy; *Decision Making; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Models; Organizational Theories; *Policy Formation; *Power Structure; Social Behavior; Spatial Relationship

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to develop a greater understanding of and suggest some methods for defining day-to-day changes in policy and predicting the operation of power and status affecting educational decisions. Physical and cognitive territoriality have meaning in the study and exercise of power and status, and are essential elements in understanding, acquiring, and exercising power and status in complex organizations. These territories play an important part in understanding the human networks that are essential to analysis and operation of power within an organization. A matrix analysis, used to analyze group structure, can reveal the connections and subgroups, thus becoming a sound model for analyzing the use of power in complex organizations. Three case studies are presented to illustrate the uses of cognitive and physical territoriality. (Author/DW)

ED105639

Presented at AERA
April, 1975

POWER, STATUS, AND COGNITIVE TERRITORY IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

By

Margaret A. Ramsey
The Pennsylvania State University

INTRODUCTION

The understanding of behavior and its fundamental value system is the basis of all observations and analysis in the social sciences. Truth, reality and perception of behavior has a great deal to do with how you analyze it. But what is the reality? What things inform our perceptions? An example from Hard Times by Studs Terkel illustrates this point:

> Pa said, "S'pose he's tell'en the truth, that fella?" The preacher answered, "He's tell'en the truth awright. The truth for him. He wasn't makin' nothin' up." "How's about us?" Tom demanded. "Is that the truth for us?" "I don't know," said Casey. (Terkel; 1970, p. 261).

This paper attempts to develop a framework which is synthesized from several areas. These areas include, anthropological participant observation, and some of the socio-spatial work that has been done. It is critical to understand that the paper attempts to describe the relationships that exist between power, cognitive territories and how these may be observed, given the restrictions of method, time, space, and perception. Cognitive territory and mental sets develop in the individuals and groups within educational and other bureaucracies. Essentially, cognitive territories can act as organizational structuring devices which allow activities to be clearly defined so that organizational overlap can be reduced. Territoriality is a useful concept in synthesizing related activities. The

EA 007 085

discussion and model presented in this paper is derived from observations of University faculty and school districts. The framework is set forth to propose how the power status and perception altered the policy of these organizations. In turn, in a feedback situation, policy makers garner, distribute, and hold power by their ability to keep in touch with the mid of the group recognizing their cognitive territories. Cognitive territories represent the individual-group concepts, ideas, norms etc., and are evidenced by the practices in organizations. This paper attempts to develop a greater understanding of and suggest some methods for defining day to day changes in policy and predicting the operation of power and status affecting educational decisions.

Theoretical Considerations

Don Juan, in Carlos Casteneda's book, Tales of Power, refers to the problem of perception. Perception, he feels, is the critical aspect in determining and garnering power. Of course, Don Juan's use of power is a way of seeing as experiencing the totality of oneself and one's universe. Knowledge is the means by which one gains this power. He says, "There is no way to refer to the unknown--one can only witness it." (Casteneda, 1974, p. 266) Don Juan may have expressed not only the problems of the participant-observer in this statement but problems in determining the identification and assessment of categories which may only be observed and experienced but cannot be measured because they exist in the minds of man. Perhaps this is one of the reasons that power and cognitive territoriality, which one must cross as a barrier and conquer if one is to reach power, such a problem for social scientists to assess. One often projects motivations while we refer to these projected motivations as the underlying cause or the basis, what we are already discussing is more of a psychological nature. We prefer to call

these categories, in which we can group patterns of behavior. Nevertheless, we are bordering on the unknown. We assume, however, that there is a relationship between what is expressed and what really exists. Evans-Pritchar' says, "that according to Comte, there is a functional relationship between social facts of different kinds, which he and Sainte Simon called "a series of social facts, political, economic, religious, moral, etc. Changes in any one of these series provokes corresponding change in the others." (Evans-Pritchard, 1951, p. 28). This suggests that experience and the overlapping nature of our universe allows us to suggest that there is, in fact, a relationship between what we see and what we believe to be the basis of our observation.

> The establishment of these correspondences, or interdependencies between one kind of social fact and another. This is the aim of sociology. It is attained by the logical method of concommittant variation, since in dealing with this very complex social phenomena in which simple variable can not be isolated, this is the only method which can be pursued. (Ibid.).

This is the problem we face in trying to deal with mental sets and other configurations that we categorize in a general name such as power and power relationships.

Another one of the problems that the observer encounters is that he often is not a member of the society that he observes. In a sense, educational bureaucracies may be compared to primitive institutions in this sence.

> Primitive institutions cannot be interpreted in terms of the mentality of the civilized inquiry into them because his mentality is a product of a different set of institutions. To suppose otherwise is to fall into what has been called the psychologist's fallacy, so often to be denounced later by Durkheim, Levy-Bruhl and other French sociologists. (Ibid., p. 35).

Evans-Pritchard continues, "Marett, Malinowski, Howie and Radin try to account for social behavior pertaining to the sacred in terms of dealings in emotional

states--hate, greed, love and all." (Ibid., p. 43). Evans-Pritchard tells us "The behavior that arises in situations of emotional stress, frustration, or intensity, and its functions is culbortic, explicative or stimulating. The development of various modern experimental psychologists showed our interpretation to be confused, irrelevant or meaningless." (Ibid.). He suggest that many anthropologists and social scientists, especially in America, "now attempt to state findings in the mixture of behavioristic and psychoanalytic psychology which is called personality psychology or the psychology of motivations and attitudes." (Ibid.) Again, however, we fall into the problem of projected motivations and projected categories. In other words, power is viewed differently by different members of idfferent groups. Power to a unionist is not the same thing as power to a university professor even if they should both be in unions. Therefore, one of the most difficult things then is to determine what the words mean to different people in the reference groups.

Don Juan states the same kind of a problem when he says:

> The first act of a teacher is to introduce the idea that the world we think we see is only a view, a description of the world. Every effort of the teacher is geared to prove this point to his apprentice. But accepting it seems to be one of the hardest things one can do; we are complacently caught in our particular view of the world, which compels us to feel and act as if we knew everything about the world. A teacher, from the very first act he performs, aims at stopping the internal dialogue, and they are convinced it is the single most important technique that an apprentice can learn. (Casteneda, 1974, p. 231).

Kenneth Boulding (1966) points out that:

> The scientific method may not be an appropirate method in the search for knowledge about social systems, perhaps because of value systems involved, perhaps because of the fact that man himself and his knowledge is part of the systems which he studies. However, the question is not whether social sciences are scientific or less rigorous than hard sciences. This just a sementic matter for there is no single method of science applicable to all systems and disciplines. The crucial question is what

> can we find out about social systems that is true? (Boulding, 1966, pp. 15-16).

The anthropologist, McGrath, points out, however:

> Differences in research methodology do make a difference in the field of research. That when we choose one methodology over another we are thereby affecting the kinds and amount of information which we can obtain from results of that study. It follows that we should choose the methodology that we will use in a given case on the basis of the kinds of information we are seeking, (the nature of the problems we are studying). We should choose so as to maximize the amount of information which we will gain about that problem. (McGrath, 1964, p. 534).

Unfortunately, when we choose our methodology for reasons of personal preference, familiarity or operational expediency, we change the nature of the problem about which we will gain information and we alter the amount of information that we can gain from our study.

Frelich says the following:

> The meaning of the data is intrinsically connected to the manner in which they are collected. It is clearly of critical importance that anthropologists state fully, frankly and unapologetically what they do, and when and how they do it. (Frelich, , p. 36).

Anytime that we are collecting data about social organizations and although we may use statistics, to collect that information we are still making observations. Therefore, time, space, use of informants is critical. One's attitude is critical whether one is aware of one's preconceptions can make a great difference. The essence of a person's studying educational bureaucracies would be the comparison of units of behavior in the different agencies and the attempt to identify and establish the major social units and seeing the variations between them. The problem encountered here is that

such a person is often involved in intermittent field work, and, therefore, leads a double or perhaps triple, or multiple life. It is clear to the "natives" that when the person is not with them, he is somewhere else and probably leading a very different sort of life. (Gonzales, 1970, p. 176).

Tales of Power

Some of the following examples of power describe access routes to power, power perceptions and how cognitive territories and valuing systems make a difference in individuals' abilities to tap into power networks. Some of these examples will be drawn from informants, some from participant-observation, and some will be drawn from descriptions of others.

Power and Perception in Public Schools

One informant related his encounter in the following way: Mr. Novice, a recently certified principal, had applied for a position in a rural school district in a state along the Eastern seaboard. On the day of his interview, he was questioned by the Assistant Superintendent and the retiring Principal whose position he was applying for. When the preliminary stages of the interview were completed, Mr. Novice was taken into the Board Room where the Assistant Superintendent, Mr. Lemon, and the retiring Principal told him he was the person they felt was going to get the job. However, he had to meet with the Superintendent of Schools, Mr. Run. Lemon went into the Superintendent's office to get Run, while Novice sat with his predecessor. Mr. Run came into the Board Room and sat on the diagonal from Novice. The retiring

principal sat to the left of Novice. Mr. Lemon sat between Mr. Run and Mr. Novice.

Run said to Novice, "We've been through an extensive number of interviews and if all of these gentlemen feel you are the best qualified for the position then I will trust their decision. However, there is something I have to tell you. (Run looked at Novice's long hair style and moustache). When we hire someone from within the school district, the Board of Education usually goes along with the decision. However, when we hire an outsider, the Board of Education likes to meet him personally, so if you could arrange next week to come down, Mr. Lemon will take you around to each board member and introduce you and you'll have a short talk with each one."

Mr. Roberts, "That's fine, I can make it next Tuesday around nine." Run, "That's fine with us also." Run hesitated, put his hand to his chin, "The majority of the board members represent the rural interests of this community, they are conservative in nature and highly religious and, therefore, their first impressions of people are very important! (He smiles at Novice). Novice looks back at Run and says, "I get the message." Mr. Run says, "Fine."

Following this, Novice goes to Lemon's office to begin his rounds of meeting school board members. He is cleanly shaven and his hair is cut in a conservative fashion. Mr. Lemon walked out of the Board Room toward his office, walking past Novice. Novice said, "Mr. Lemon, good morning." Lemon turned and with a smile on his face, he said, "Mr. Novice, I didn't recognize you--you look like an entirely different person.

The analysis of this episode is not difficult. We can see some spatial distancing going on as Mr. Novice relates the seating arrangement. Other rather obvious conclusions might be drawn from this. The Superintendent, Mr. Run is telling Mr. Novice that as an outsider, he is taking a risk on him. He is also conveying information about dress and appearance not only for his formal presentation and entry into th community but also is making a possible reference to expected behavior from Novice in the future. By having his associates around at this point in making a comment about what may be organizationally correct but is nevertheless a personal prerogative of Mr. Novice's, that of his personal grooming and appearance, Mr. Run is conveying to his associates such as Mr. Lemon, the fact that he does have the power to make such assessments and expects the behaviors that he requests. Mr. Novice, by agreeing to this condition, is also accepting and acceding to the power and authority of Mr. Run. This incident also shows us by Mr. Run's references to the rural community that as a small and gemmeshaft society only minimal differences in behavior and dress will be tolerated by the members of that community. It suggests that if the new principal is to survive at all in his administrative role, he must succumb to such pressures that might otherwise be viewed in, say an urban situation, as an infringement on his personal life. This same kind of phenomenon is cited by Vidich and Bensman (1958) in Small Town in Mass Society in the case of Mr. Peabody, the Supervisory Principal. This incident may be contrasted with the same informant's experience in an urban school district. In the first example, it was shown how an outsider with no power contacts into the bureaucracy was treated on an initial interview. The second example relates how power networks and cognitive territories interact when there

is a power tie-in of some kind:

"Mr. Conway, a former teacher and administrator in the Valley School District had left the school system for two years to enter a graduate program in a nearby university. After completion of this university training, he attempted to secure positions in other districts. When unable to accomplish this goal, he again applied to the Valley School District. Like most other large urban districts, Valley gives tests periodically in order to qualify and select individuals for administration positions and formulates lists of qualified candidates for positions based on those tests. Mr. Conway's brother was on the executive board of the Valley Teachers Union (V.T.U.). Since it was the middle of the year, Mr. Conway knew that regular channels would not produce the desired job he sought. He called his brother who informed him that he should give the personnel director of Valley a call the next day to secure an interview. Mr. Conway followed this advice and an interview was set up for the following week. The personnel director informed Conway that an administrative assistant position would be open for him immediately. Conway kept his appointment with the personnel director who took him to the individual who maintained the listing of open positions in the Valley District. Conway picked a school from the four choices offered him, filled out the proper forms and filled out a card that Conway was to present to the principal of the selected school. The personnel office called the principal, Mr. Masters, and informed him that a qualified candidate had been secured to fill his open assistantship and that Conway would be coming over with the card to be signed by Masters, indicating his acceptance of the candidate. Conway drove to the school arriving just before lunch time. As he entered the principal's office, Masters was on the phone. He waved Conway

to a chair and completed his call. As Masters hung up the phone, he turned toward Conway, "This is surprising - having someone to fill this position at this time of the year," he said, "how did you manage it?" Conway explained his circumstance, that he had left to do doctoral work and when he returned he was informed that the position in Master's school was open. Masters asked if there were other schools with similar open positions. Conway replied (not quite truthfully), "This was the only one!" Masters asked Conway to tell him about himself and his experience. Mr. Conway then related his past professional and academic experiences to Mr. Masters. Masters said, "I see nothing wrong with your qualifications for the position. Do you live in Valley City?" Mr. Conway said, "Yes." Conway was familiar with a ruling in Valley City that any persons hired after 1971 had to live in the city boundaries or could not get a position. (Conway was using a false address at the time and living outside the City). Masters, "Are there any qualifications you would put on your position as administrative assistant, anything I would direct you to do that you feel you should not be doing?" Conway, "No, as administrative assistant, I realize my job is to handle jobs which will free your time to concentrate on instructional programs and observations of teachers and things like that." Masters, "Well, I think that's fine and again I see no reason why I shouldn't accept you. You certainly have the qualifications: you have the right mental attitude, also the prefessional experience." Conway, "Thank you." Masters, "There is a certain problem because no administrative assistant was assigned to the school in the beginning of the year so we have a teacher on special assignment (Mr. Word) he knew all along this was going to happen. I'll just have to tell him about it. He's a fine man, worked hard, we've

grown accustomed to him. But, I am sure it will work out." Conway, "I am sure we can work together as a team." Masters signed the card given to Conway at the personnel office. "Take it back to the personnel office and tell them it's fine," he said, "You know, I have no power not to accept you anyway." Conway, "You don't?" Masters, "No, according to Union contract, you qualify for the position, have all the necessary pre-requisites and there is really nothing I can do. I have to accept you whether I thought you were qualified or not." Conway, "Then why do you go through signing the card in the interview or is it just a ritual?" Masters, hesitantly, "Well, no I do have some say in who I hire and who I don't hire, but generally speaking, you have to accept the individual if qualified, you know with the Union contract the principal doesn't have that much power anymore." The conversation ended with a cordial farewell. Conway returned to the personnel office to finish the bureaucratic routine of re-entry.

These two vignettes point out differing aspects of power in educational organizations. In the rural school district, the Assistant Superintendent and the retiring principal interviewed Mr. Novice for the position. However, when it cam down to the final hiring of the position and final informal screening, the Superintendent controlled the interview. Mr. Novice was informed of the outward appearances necessary to convey to the school board members an acceptance of the rules and the conservative values and orientations of the community.

In the larger urban school district, the interview was conducted by the director of personnel. The interview was not a formal proceeding. Because of power tug in the organization between Union and school district power, Mr. Conway was able to circumvent the usual procedure of

formal testing and the waiting list. Hence, Mr. Conway entered Valley School District through an informal power source (personal influence of a union office) rther than the formal route. The principal who was at the end of the screening process was powerless in the acceptance or rejection of Conway due to union regulations, school district policy and other regulations. Apparently, this last interview by the principal was an attempt at maintaining a formal status and power of the principal. However, there appears to be no authority for the principal in the matter. The principal seemed frustrated at the fact that he had no control over the personnel that entered his building other than a clear mandate in regard to the position and individual's qualifications for it.

Cognitive Territoriality in the Land of the Cognitive Grants

The following "vignette" was drawn from the participatory observations of the author at a faculty meeting in a rather prestigious university, although not one of the top five, in terms of well known universities that "make" the top five, such as Harvard. Suffice it to say, the institution is a UCEA affiliated university and the faculty meeting is composed of members of an educational administration department. All members have been coded for the sake of the protection of the individuals represented and the author's desire to use the example for illustrative purposes and not to "deride" anyone.

Departmental faculty meetings are regular events at most universities. They serve many purposes--among them: bringing up "new business," promotions, student candidacy, course offerings and changes, etc. They tend to encapsulate and serve as a record for the representative activities of university departments. It is no great secret that, like most regular

meetings, they are often ritual and political. What an outsider may observe would be just the surface conversations. Though with a closer look at non-verbal behavior, a deeper structural meaning would emerge.

A note on membership of this particular meeting may be relevant. It is usual for faculty members only to have access to such meetings, with the exception of designated student representatives, who probably number no more than two of the total membership. They usually cannot cast votes on decisions. "Nitty gritty" topics are usually discussed at times when the student representatives are for one reason or another not present. In this way, such aspects of faculty territoriality resembles the elders of the tribe dismissing the uninitiated in the secret societies, moeities, etc. Or, it may be likened to levels of priesthood, in the present practices of certain religions where members are allowed to participate according to levels of initiation.

The meeting took place in June of 1974 on a Friday. It was held in a room which used to be the office of the Head of a Center in which educational administration was one of four units. Educational administration department meetings had been held here even before the head of the unit resigned and returned to the role of full professor without administrative title, power and status, the room was now used as a reading room. The room, therefore, held a variety of memories for the different faculty members.

The first two professors to enter the room were the former Center Head, Dr. John, and a third year untenured professor, Dr. Karla. Next, a tenured, well-published full professor entered, Dr. Elm. He sat catercorner to Dr. John, even though many other seats were available, but then moved to the other side of the same table. Next, Dr. Naybor came in,

pulled out the same chair that Dr. Elm had initially pulled out, started to sit down, paused, and said in a sarcastic way, "Seating arrangements are important here." Then he moved to another chair. Dr. Naybor was a third year untenured professor. At the time Dr. Naybor entered, he was followed by a graduate student representative (one of the designees who could attend) and as soon as Dr. Naybor made his "seating-space" comment, the student said, "I better take a second order seat here." He looked around at several seats before deciding on one. He said to Dr. Naybor, after hearing Dr. Naybor's comment, "Those kind of comments will get you no where, I assure you." Dr. DeWindt, the oldest faculty member came in, pulled a chair from the table where Dr. Karla was sitting and went over to the "line" that was forming with Dr. Elm and Dr. Naybor. As he sat down, Dr. DeWindt moved the chair away from Dr. Elm and Dr. Naybor by about six feet. At this point, about three-fourths of the faculty members were present. Dr. Walker, the only male minority member came in. Dr. DeWindt acknowledged him by gesturing toward a chair. Dr. Walker looked around, smiled at Dr. DeWindt and took a chair on one side of Dr. Karla. Dr. DeWindt quipped, "Well, I think we have enough for a consensus now."

Meanwhile, conversations as well as non-verbal notations of arrivals and seating choices had been taking place. Each time someone came in and took a seat, the various members would briefly look toward another colleague, usually a friend for their reaction to the arrival's choice of a seat. Smiles, frowns, and other gestures were noted - a few "poker" faces were indistinguishable as to their reactions. The observer was not able to follow every conversation simultaneously, but could get the "gist" of most conversations by noting key words. Drs. Walker and Naybor

were engaged in some nameless verbal conflict.

By this time, three distinct factional lines could be discerned by the three line spacings in seating arrangements. Professor John interjected a joking comment, attempting to divert the Walker-Naybor controversy. After he did this, Dr. Elm gave Dr. Naybor what way he described as a "sly" look. Dr. Naybor registered on response on his face, although he did face Dr. Elm when Dr. Elm attempted to deliver a silent cue.

Dr. Park had entered the conference room by this time. He had on sunglasses, so it was difficult to watch his eyes and expressions. He frequently wore sunglasses and kept them on inside the building. Dr. Park had been the Director of the department when Dr. John was Center Head.. In fact, Dr. John had appointed him and knew him from a previous association at another university; the one where Dr. Karla received her training. Dr. Karla did not know either of the professors at the time of her training at that university, since their exit preceded her entrance to the particular department to which they were attached. Dr. Park continued in his role as department head even after Dr. John's resignation.

Dr. Naybor said to Dr. Park, "We should see what is the market course for students." He suggested asking various students in the department what value they felt a particular course in question held. He said that by asking several students who were around, the faculty could determine how students felt.

Dr. John interjected and said, "That's not how we should determine what students think. In order to fairly determine how students are using the course to determine need, we must randomly sample a number

of students." Dr. Park played with his pencil during this comment. He frequently drew doodles and ripped fringes in paper cups during heated debates. Dr. Park also drew interesting designs on many of these "fringed" paper cups. Dr. Park and Dr. John both smoked pipes. Dr. Park invariably would borrow tobacco from Dr. John during these faculty meetings.

Dr. John got nervous and pulled his chair toward the elderly Dr. DeWindt. Dr. Naybor scowled at Dr. John. Dr. Park got extremely red in the face.

Dr. Naybor attempted to move toward a vote and raised his voice. He pointed out in a hostile way that his proposal was consistent with Dr. Park's notion. Dr. Park supported Dr. Naybor's "sampling technique." Dr. Elm concurred with Dr. Park and stated that an "enormous mailing" (unknown at the time of the meeting) indicated that the course was felt to be unnecessary by most students.

At this point, Dr. Walker strenuously objected. He questioned Dr. Elm about the enormous mailing Dr. Walker countered and said, "But, you aren't even addressing yourself to Dr. John's question.

Dr. Elm answered in rapid fire, "I'm against it (the sample). That should be enough."

Dr. Park said to Dr. Walker, "Well, I think that's sufficient talk about this matter."

Again, Dr. Walker said to Dr. Park that Dr. John's suggestion of proper sample is not the issue, but rather that proper departmental procedure was the issue and represented a policy issue that touched on almost all faculty procedures. Dr. Park ignored Dr. Walker.

Dr. Walker threw his hands up in the air several times in exasperation

then gripped the table very tightly with his fingers. His mouth took on a firm, hard line.

Dr. Park suggested, "Draw Dr. John in. Let him do this thing properly. He does it all the time anyway."

Dr. DeWindt said quickly, "Right, let's at least offer the course experimentally." (Dr. DeWindt generally took a dim view of experimental courses, so this was a departure from his usual actions.)

Dr. Elm decided to "draw on the revered dead," a power figure, after whom the building the meeting took place in was named, "Sackley." "I had a different idea of what this department should be and so did Sackley."

Dr. John answered, "Well, it can't be a one man department."

Dr. Elm countered, "We need a strong research atmosphere. That should be this department's tone."

After this set of exchanges, a temporary lull lasted for about five minutes. The rest of the meeting which resumed after the "lull" was devoted to a discussion of how many areas should be included in the doctoral comprehensive exams. The debate was ever whether "comps" should have seven areas or eight areas. Four people wanted seven, six people wanted eight areas. Drs. Elm, Park, and Naybor concluded this part of the meeting with similar comments about the vote: "Who cares," "It's done," etc.

Dr. John went to get coffee. As he returned, Dr. Naybor, who had been carefully watching Dr. Karla's note taking said, "Don't worry about anything, fellows. Dr. Karla's getting it all down. She's doing participatory field observation."

Dr. Karla retorted, "That's good, Dr. Naybor, a really good state-

ment. I hope you have data to support that statement." Dr. Naybor and Dr. Karla's fracus amused several faculty members.

This statement marked the end of the lengthy (two and one-half hour meeting) and several made movements as if to leave. Dr. DeWindt left first. All others remained at this point.

Dr. Walker and Dr. Park started a debate. Again, the observer was able to discern that it was over the "comps" vote. Dr. Walker also engaged in some of the controversy with Dr. Elm. Dr. Elm suggested that Political Policy in Education be eliminated as an area from the comprehensive exams. This was Dr. John's area. Also, as preparation for this area, Dr. John's two political policy courses were necessary for preparation by the students.

Dr. Park diverted the issue by changing the subject to the "Branch Campus" issue. He usually brought this up at critical times where he wished to change the subject or take "fire" away from one by introducing an unrelated subject. He spoke on it for five or so minutes. Drs. Park and Naybor then went outside the room for coffee (a coffee urn was stationed on a table right outside the door).

They returned. The "Kerr memo" was introduced. It related to faculty committee membership. Each student, upon being admitted to candidacy, selected a committee, which began aiding him at that point in preparing his or her doctoral dissertation. The "Kerr memo" was a landmark in faculty policy because it essentially changed the requirements for eligibility of faculty membership. Kerr was the Acting Dean of the College of Education.

Dr. Elm suggested that "the waters be tested." He said this two or three times during the discussion of the "Kerr memo."

The discussion shifted to a new student about whom little was known. Additional information on the student's capabilities would be needed before his doctoral candidacy could be voted on. Dr. Elm ended the meeting with a "slow bullet" and suggested that the faculty "put him in Dr. John's seminar."

Conclusions

It seems fairly evident from both spatial line divisions and verbal exchanges that this faculty as small as it was, is factionalized. Seating, as Dr. Naybor pointed out early in the discussion, was an interesting and important cue that gave evidence not only of power, and status, but also of territorial imperatives. Such seating arrangements as well as nonverbal gestures demonstrated a value system that reflects a deeper and often camoflauged array of belief, of cognitive territoriality. These values range from purely faculty educational matters to policy and the way was to be operationalized in terms of a less obvious set of values that were personal in nature. Many of the "cuts" or subtle verbal "bullets" reflected both personal animosities as well as personal sympathies that colleagues felt for each other. Some of the animosities and sympathies (on a range, of course) occurred because of some topic introduced at the meeting or some conflict or emotional response evidenced at the meeting. But other displays, of both varieties, referred back to events that preceded this meeting and to people long dead (i.e., Sackley). While the meeting occurred in 1974, the resignation of Dr. John occurred in 1973. The feelings about the meeting room dated to 1973, when Dr. John vacated it, with his resignation (political) from his role. This fact shows that people often have territorial "hangovers" about rooms long after the function of the room

changes. Dr. Park barrowed Dr. John's tobacco when he was Center Director, and continued to do so long after Dr. John's "downfall." This was interesting, since it was rumored that Dr. Park contributed to Dr. John's downfall.

It thus becomes clear that territoriality, both physical and cognitive, have meaning in the study and exercise of power and status. Additionally, physical and cognitive territoriality (although separate as conceptual unities) are interactive. The room where the faculty meeting was held is different than the memories and feelings share by Dr. John and his remaining allies about his resignation as Center Director. But in another sense they were not separate. The presence of one initiated the other and this in turn may have accounted for the degree of hostility observed between the factorial groups.

In the school district examples, it was also clear that cognitive territory (the ownership of progerative or lack of it) affected behavior. Where these territories overlayed, tension broke out. Thus, space or territory--either cognitive or physical becomes an essential element in understanding, acquiring and exercising power and status in complex organizations. Festinger, Schacter, and Back (1955) point out that matrix analysis may be useful in the analysis of group structures. Since social structure is acted out spatially structuralism could well be applied to ferret out the design of such group structures. Additionally, structuralism concentrates on "mère" or mother structures of which matrix analysis is an essential part. Groups tend toward the following:

1. two-step indirect connections
2. three-step or more connections

and 3. sub-group formation. (Ibid., pp. 358-367).

The faculty meeting shows some of these formations. Drs. Elm, Park and Naybor formed one contingent. Drs. John, Karla and Walker form another. Dr. DeWindt, by virtue of being the elder statesman, can go either way. Another member, who was not present at the meeting, Dr. Hopewell, tended towards neutrality, although if pressed, might support either side. Dr. John and Dr. Karla formed another subset, while Dr. Elm and Dr. Park represented another, often taking in when separated, to the novice, Dr. Naybor. Sponsorship is evident then even at the power-status level for "junior" professors. This is evidenced by the spatial alignment.

It is interesting that neutrals such as Dr. DeWindt often lose their neutral position by virtue of trying to keep the peace. By merely suggesting "fairness" they can step on toes and cast their weight on the side of the underdog. Neutrals also belie their real feelings of affinity for one group or another by the seats they choose, the remarks they make, and/or other small gestures.

These and other data describe the cognitive and physical territories that play such an important part in understanding the human networks that operate in complex organizations. Such networks are essential to the analysis and operation of power as well as the development and maintenance of personal status within the organization. It is therefore suggested that this model is heuristic as well as theoretically sound as a basis for analyzing the use of power in complex organizations.

Footnotes

Boulding, Kenneth. The Impact of the Social Sciences, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N.J., 1966.

Castenda, Carlos. Tales of Power, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1974.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E. Social Anthropology, Cohen and West, Ltd., London, 1951.

Festinger, Leon, Schacter, Stanley and Back, Kurt, "Matrix Analysis of Group Structures" in The Language of Social Research, ed.by Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1955.

Frelich, Merris, "Toward a Formalization of Field Work," in Marginal Natives: Anthropologists at Work, ed. Morris Frelich, Harper and Row, New York, 1970.

Gonzalez, Nancie Solien, "Cachiqueles and Caribs: The Social Context of Field Work," in Marginal Natives: Anthropologists at Work, ed. Morris Frelich, Harper and Row, New York, 1970.

McGrath, Joseph, "Toward a Theory of Method," in New Perspectives in Organizational Research, ed. W.W. Cooper, New York

Terkel, Studs. Hard Times, Pantheon Books, New York, 1970, p. 3 (from Steinbeck, John, The Grapes of Wrath, New York, Viking Press, 1939).

Viditch and Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society, Doubleday & Co., Inc., New York, 1958.